

MAR 27 1926

MEDICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICHIGAN

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at  
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.  
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of  
March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on  
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XIX, No. 19

MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1926

WHOLE No. 522



## Columbia University

In the City of New York

### SUMMER SESSION

July 6 to August 13, 1926



Courses will be offered in many subjects in the different Schools of Columbia University, parallel and equivalent to those of the academic year, counting toward the degrees of A.B., B.S., A.M., M.S., Ph.D., LL.B., and various diplomas of Teachers College.

#### GREEK

**Elementary Course** (= Entrance Greek a)

Professor Eugene Tavenner

**Xenophon**

(= Entrance Greek b)

Professor Eugene Tavenner

**Sophocles**

(College Course)

Professor Clinton W. Keyes

#### LATIN

**Elementary Course**

(For Beginners)

Mr. Irving C. Demarest

**Caesar, Gallic War**

(= Entrance Latin 3)

Professor Clinton W. Keyes

**Vergil, Aeneid**

(= Entrance Latin 5)

Mr. Irving C. Demarest

**Cicero: Intensive Study**

(= Entrance Latin 4)

Dr. John E. Barss

**Cicero: Selected Orations**

(= Entrance Latin 4)

Dr. John E. Barss

**Prose Composition**

(= Entrance Latin 6)

Dr. John E. Barss

**Prose Composition**

(For Teachers)

Professor Hubert M. Poteat

**Livy**

(College Course)

Professor Frank H. Cowles

**Odes of Horace**

(College Course)

Dr. Robert S. Rogers

**Prose Composition**

(College Course)

Dr. Robert S. Rogers

**Earlier Roman Literature of the Republic**

Professor Karl P. Harrington

**Vergil, Aeneid**

(Advanced Course)

Professor Charles Knapp

**The Latin of the Middle Ages**

Mr. Richard McKeon

**The Roman Historians**

Professor Hubert M. Poteat

**Roman Satire**

Professor Karl P. Harrington

**Prose Composition**

(For the A.M. degree)

Professor Charles Knapp

**The Roman World of Caesar, Cicero, Vergil**

Professor Frank H. Cowles

**Teaching Latin in Secondary Schools**

Miss Frances E. Sabin

**Demonstration Class in Beginning Latin**

Miss Frances E. Sabin

#### ANCIENT HISTORY

**Ancient History** (General Course) Mr. Maxwell H. Saville

**Source History of Greece**

Professor Caspar J. Kraemer, Jr.

**Hellenistic Civilization from Alexander to**

**Augustus**

Professor William L. Westermann

#### PUBLIC LECTURES ON GREEK AND LATIN SUBJECTS

For Announcement of Summer Session of 1926, Address the  
Secretary of Columbia University, New York City.

## Harrington's Roman Elegiac Poets

Edited by KARL POMEROY HARRINGTON, Professor of the Latin Language and Literature, Wesleyan University. Cloth, 12mo., 444 pages, with Introduction and Notes. \$1.80. Text edition, \$0.60.

A JUDICIOUS selection from the whole field of Roman elegy, with suitable introductory matter and English comments, is presented in this volume. The selections have been confined strictly to poems written in the elegiac measure, and include the best of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid.

Extensive notes and cross-references assist the student to a comprehensive knowledge of this type of Roman poetry, while the Introduction gives a brief account of its origin and development and the share in this movement borne by each author represented.

---

### AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO BOSTON ATLANTA

## D'OOGHE-ROEHM: JUNIOR LATIN LESSONS



A NEW book for Junior High Schools---meeting in spirit and content all recommendations of the Classical Investigation.

GINN AND COMPANY

70 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XIX, No. 19

MONDAY, MARCH 22, 1926

WHOLE No. 522

## A NEW SPANISH SERIES OF CLASSICAL TEXTS

As every one knows, Germany has had, for decades, its famous Teubner Series of editions of the texts of Greek and Latin authors. In the last decade of the nineteenth century, the Oxford University Press began the publication of the Oxford Classical Texts Series, which has assumed imposing proportions.

During the World War France and Italy set about producing similar Series for themselves. The French Series, published under the auspices of the Association Budé, of which Professor R. G. Kent wrote in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 18.17-18, now contains many volumes. Some of these are like the volumes of the Loeb Classical Library, in that they contain a text, Greek or Latin, on one page, and a translation (in French, of course), opposite the text. Texts and translations are also published separately. The Series contains also volumes on various aspects of classical literature and civilization.

The Italian Series, known as the *Corpus Scriptorum Classicorum Paravianum*, now includes many volumes. These, however, are all small. The text of the *Aeneid*, for example, requires four volumes.

I gave a short account of the French Series and of the Italian Series in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 15.135-136 (March 6, 1922).

In 1923, there was begun, at Barcelona, Spain, the publication of another Series of this sort, "*Una Col·lecció Catalana dels Clàssics Grecs i Llatins*", under the auspices of the *Fundació Bernat Metge*. The Director of the *Fundació* is Mr. Joan Estelrich (address, Apartment 789, Barcelona, Spain).

It is a pleasure to list here the volumes of this new Series, so far as they have come to my attention. Each volume contains a *Praefatio*, usually short, and critical notes. The latter are, in general, not numerous. Most of the volumes contain an *Index Nominum*. Such additional details about each volume as seem worth attention I give below. Unless it is otherwise stated, a volume contains text only.

Ausonius, Volume 1, edited by Carles Riba and Joaquim Balcells.

Cicero, *Brutus*, edited by Gumersind Alabart.

Cicero, *Orationes*, Volume 1, edited by Josep M. Llobera and Joan Estelrich. This contains *Pro Quinctio*, *Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino*, *Pro Q. Roscio Comodo*, and the extant fragments of the *Pro M. Tullio*. The *Praefatio* and the apparatus criticus are both fuller than usual.

Q. Curtius Rufus, Volume 1, Books 3-4, edited by Manuel de Montoliu, Professor in the University of Buenos Aires. This contains both text and translation. The *Introducció* deals with the author (I-

XXII), his work (XXII-XXXVI), the text and the editions (XXXVII-XLII).

Lucretius, Volume 1, Books 1-3, edited by Joaquim Balcells. This volume contains both text and translation. The *Introducció* deals with the life of Lucretius (I-XIII), his poem (XIII-XIX), the text (XIX-XXIII), and the editions (XXIV-XXVIII). The editor knows the literature of Lucretius. The editions of Munro, Giussani, Merrill, and Ernout, for example, are named and described. We see here, as in other volumes of the Series, a wide acquaintance with editions in various languages, as well as with special articles on the several authors.

Cornelius Nepos, complete, edited by Manuel de Montoliu and Joaquim Balcells.

Plato, Volumes 1 and 2, in a beautiful Greek text, small, but clear, edited by Joan Crexells. Volume 1 contains *Apology*, *Crito*, *Laches*, and *Euthyphro*, Volume 2 *Charmides*, *Lysis*, and *Protagoras*.

Pliny the Elder, *Historia Naturalis*, Volume 1, Books 1-2, text and translation, by Marçal Olivar. The *Introducció* (I-XXV) deals with the life of Pliny, the *Historia Naturalis*, and with the manuscripts. We may notice here an interesting feature of the volumes that contain both text and translation: the corresponding pages of text and translation are numbered identically.

Propertius, complete, in one volume. The text was edited by Joaquim Balcells. The translation is by Joan Mínguez. The *Introducció* (I-XXVI) discusses the life of Propertius, his elegies, his meters, the manuscripts, and the commentaries on Propertius.

Seneca, two volumes, edited by Carles Cardó. In one volume we find the text of *De Brevitate Vitae*, *De Vita Beata*, *De Providentia*; in the other the text of *De Ira*, complete. The apparatus criticus in these volumes is especially full.

Tibullus, complete, edited and translated by Carles Magrinyà and Joan Mínguez. The text of Tibullus appears in precisely the arrangement found in that fine book, by the lamented Kirby Flower Smith, *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus* (American Book Company, 1913). There is a very elaborate *Introducció* (I-LXXXI), dealing with Tibullus's life, his character, his elegies (their authenticity, their chronology, the formation and the publication of the *Corpus Tibullianum*), the sources of Tibullus, the meters of Tibullus, the text, and the editions. Professor Smith's edition is described, on pages LXXX-LXXXI, in highly eulogistic terms.

Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, edited by Carles Riba.

The volumes that have come into my hands are bound in paper, not very securely. They are, however, all cheap. The prices are given in "Pts" or



"Ptes" (there is a curious inconsistency here in spelling, as there is in that of the names of the Spanish authors of the several volumes). I interpret "Pts" as meaning *pesetas* (francs). Most of the volumes cost 4.50 pesetas; some cost 7.50 pesetas. Even the large, sumptuously printed volume of Pliny is listed at the latter price. The Lucretius, however, is listed at 18 pesetas.

It remains only to congratulate the classical scholars of the Spanish-speaking world on their enterprise in undertaking this Series, and on the success which has thus far attended their efforts. May the Series continue indefinitely, with increasing success.

CHARLES KNAPP

### REVIEWS

An Etymological Study of the Ten Thousand Words in Thorndike's *Teacher's Word Book*. By Edward V. Lindsay. Indiana University Studies: Study No. 65: Bloomington, Indiana (1923). Pp. 115. 75 cents.

Mr. Lindsay's laborious Etymological Study of the Ten Thousand Words in Thorndike's *Teacher's Word Book* is intended to show (1) the relative importance of Latin and of Greek as sources of the English vocabulary, (2) the relative importance in this connection of the several Latin and Greek source words, and (3) the relative value of Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil for giving the student a command of the Latin source words. The author devised a system that could be handled quite mechanically, and I find no serious flaws in his statistical method. If the fundamental assumptions and the individual judgments upon which the work was based had been sound, the results would have been reliable. Since, however, errors of judgment are numerous and some of the basic assumptions false, the work has been quite in vain.

In spite of the title of the monograph, no independent "etymological study" was undertaken by Mr. Lindsay. The etymologies are Skeat's, whose Etymological Dictionary of the English Language was preferred to the New Oxford Dictionary because it is easier to handle and can be used outside a library. Hence there are many errors in the monograph, such as the assignment of English *rose* to Greek *rodon* (*sic*) rather than to Latin *rosa*.

<The *Teacher's Word Book*, by Edward L. Thorndike, a psychologist, was published by Teachers College, Columbia University, in 1921. In *Teachers College Record* 22:334-370 (September, 1921) Professor Thorndike had published an article entitled *Word Knowledge in the Elementary School*.

In connection with what Professor Sturtevant says in his review of Mr. Lindsay's monograph I may refer to certain utterances of my own regarding a somewhat similar study. These appear in an article entitled *Mr. Franklin on the Derivation of Certain Words*, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16:113-114, 152. In *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16:151-152, Professor Lane Cooper, commenting on my remarks, and on Mr. Franklin's study, asks, "... why was not the Oxford Dictionary used for this purpose? How could any one undertake such a study as Mr. Franklin's while ignorant of that monumental work—A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles?" I should modify this by asking, How could any one undertake such a study as Mr. Lindsay undertook without using the Oxford Dictionary, and without, after he had used that Dictionary, having his results checked by a competent expert in the field of "linguistics"? Indeed, why was not the advice of one or more such experts taken before the study was even begun? Let me go a step further: only such an expert should have made this study.

C. K.

It is a mistake to insist on referring a word to its "ultimate source" whether or not this is the word the student is likely to meet. *February* is traced by Mr. Lindsay to *februum* (a word that no High School student ought ever to hear), and, since *February* is a fairly common English word, our author arrives at the conclusion that *februum* is a more important word to know than *periculum*, *caelum*, *consulere*, *fumus*. Of course the Latin word that should figure here is *Februarius*. Why should *defend* be assigned to the grammarians' word *fendere* instead of to the familiar *defendere*? This curious practice, however, is not followed consistently. *Ardere* appears in the list in place of its "ultimate source" *aridus*, and English *fragile* is set down opposite Accius's queer word *fragescere*, instead of being set opposite the equally primitive *fragilis* or the more primitive *frangere*.

All compounds containing a verb are referred to that verb rather than to the other member of the compound. Hence *navigate* is credited to *agere* rather than to *navis*, *crucify* to *figere*, not to *crux*, *legislate* to *ferre* instead of to *lex*. These arbitrary decisions vitiate the work so far as it presumes to determine the relative importance of Latin words.

Far more serious are the unsound assumptions that lie at the very basis of the study. It is assumed without discussion that it is the Latin source of an English word that counts rather than the immediate source, no matter how extensive the changes of form and meaning. Now English *aid* is borrowed from French *aider*, which is descended from Latin *adiutare*, which in turn is a derivative of *adiuvare*, which, finally, is a compound of *iuvare*; but nothing could be more absurd than to suppose that a High School student can be helped to understand or to use English *aid* by learning Latin *iuvare*. The teachers of French will sooner or later bring us to merited shame if we continue to claim what is properly theirs. English *aid* is a French loan-word, as any child who studies French can easily see. If etymology could really help at all in the mastery of so simple and familiar a vocable, it would be necessary to study French rather than Latin to see the true inwardness of English *aid*.

But I am not interested to fight the battles of the French teachers. I am worried over a more vital matter, a danger which threatens the intelligence of American youth. As a result of much loose talk about the value of the study of Latin as an aid to an understanding of the English vocabulary, I fear that High School teachers of Latin will undertake to drill their students in some of these etymologies which cannot be understood without wider linguistic knowledge than they possess. An intelligent boy who, without full explanation, is required to learn that *crux* is the source of *cruise*, *cavus* of *jail*, *bulia* of *budge*, *circus* of *research*, or that *capere* has spawned a motley progeny including *case*, *cash*, *casket*, *catch*, *conceive*, *deceive*, *prince*, *purchase*, *staircase*, *recover*, *sash*, and *scarce* will either drop out of School or turn his attention to a subject where his teachers can give reasons for their statements. If School and parental requirements hold him

long at such a study, he will lose all capacity to understand the structure of his own or any other language.

Etymology properly pursued is an extremely interesting and satisfying study; but once you begin to skip essential steps in the history of words, it becomes a stultifying and deadening sham. A very considerable proportion of the etymologies upon which Mr. Lindsay bases his figures can have value only for those who know French. Indeed, in many cases a knowledge of the comparative grammar of the Romance languages would also be required. Quite possibly Mr. Lindsay does not mean to recommend that such etymologies be studied in the High School, but, if not, he should not have assigned to them numerical or other values in his Tables.

Still more fallacious is the tacit assumption that to know the etymology of an English word necessarily helps one to understand and use it. The truth is that etymology cannot improve our understanding of a really familiar word of our native language<sup>2</sup>. A child can use the word *pin* as efficiently without as with the knowledge that it comes from Latin *pinna*. The value of this knowledge is simply that it satisfies a reasonable curiosity; it appeals to something more important in human nature than the utilitarian motives with which the professors of pedagogy operate. Mr. Lindsay, however, assumes not merely that the etymology of *pin* has a utilitarian value, but that this value can be measured by the relative frequency of the word *pin*.

On the other hand, *ferrum* is classed as one of the least important words in the list because its English derivatives are rare. It is, as a matter of fact precisely because they are rare and therefore unfamiliar that *ferrum* is one of the most important Latin words for a child to learn. How thoroughly this fact undermines Mr. Lindsay's entire structure appears when we look for the derivatives of *ferrum* in his table. We expect to find such words as *ferrous*, *ferriferous*, *ferromagnetic*, and *ferromanganese*—words which are immediately clear to a Latin scholar, but exceedingly difficult to all others. Instead, we find just one word cited, namely *fret*. Of course the reason is that the words we expected to find are not included in Professor Thorndike's Teacher's Word Book. It may be that teachers of English in the High Schools should lay particular stress upon 10,000 common words; but it is the high privilege of the Latin teacher and still more of the Greek teacher to provide help just where help is needed—in understanding the difficult words.

I do not wish to be hard on Mr. Lindsay. He undertook a peculiarly onerous and disagreeable task in order to help the classical cause as it was presented to him by the Advisory Committee of the American Classical League. It is safe to say that neither these gentlemen nor anybody else told him what sort of equipment is essential to such work as this. The

result is only what must be expected as long as American classical scholars are content to live in almost complete ignorance of the science of language.

YALE UNIVERSITY

E. H. STURTEVANT

Mythology. By Jane Ellen Harrison. Boston: Marshall Jones Company (1924). Pp. xx + 155. \$1.50.

Miss Harrison is always a fascinating and stimulating writer. Her little book on Mythology, in the Series entitled *Our Debt to Greece and Rome*, has these qualities in prominent measure. That the contents of the book are not at all what the title leads the reader to expect is probably due no less to the necessity of condensation than to the writer's individuality and interests. Nor, as she herself says (142), was there any need to show by tabulation how often modern literature has embellished itself with classical allusions. It would be a charming and illuminating task, indeed, not only to collect the instances in the great poets of English speech, but to analyze them and show from the psychology of each author just why he was influenced by what attracted him. In Miss Harrison's opinion (in a half-apologetic way the Editors of the Series, in their Preface, call this point to the reader's attention), it is more important to disseminate a knowledge of the origins of Greek religion, and to show how through the Greek method of handling this crude material the sense of beauty expelled fear from the field of religious thought (xv, 144-147). Moreover, Miss Harrison states at the outset (xi) that her task is to formulate the debt which Christianity owes to Greece.

As is well known, our author came to the study of Greek mythology and religion from the starting-point of archaeology. Throughout her published works—from the *Monuments* (New York, 1890) to the *Epilegomena* (Cambridge, 1921)—she has steadfastly approached every question of divine personality, legend, and practice from the evidence of the monuments. Nor has she proven herself impervious to the views of the anthropological school of religious history. Indeed, among classicists she is to-day probably the foremost exponent and adherent of the scintillating theories of Sir James G. Frazer and Gilbert Murray. The new book carries her further away than ever from the sobriety of philological-historical research. For she has now also come under the influence of the psychological view of religion, specifically of James H. Leuba (*The Psychological Origin and the Nature of Religion* [London, 1909]) and Charles Baudouin (*The Birth of Psyche* [London, 1923]), and she does not disdain to quote even Coué and his theories about auto-suggestion. Let me state from the beginning that I cannot follow her on this precipitous path. Nobody is further than I from denying the value of the Golden Bough as an inexhaustible storehouse of analogies, or the fact that religious thought is determined more by the laws of psychology than by those of logic. But I cannot follow the work of the school which Miss Harrison so brilliantly expounds in its neglect of the results of painstaking investigation of the value of the

<sup>2</sup>On this view of Professor Sturtevant I had something to say, by way of modification, in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 13.49-50, in a paper entitled *English Derivatives and the Study of Latin*. Professor Sturtevant's present utterance, including, as it does, the expression "a really familiar word", I find less disquieting than I found his earlier pronouncements. C. K. >

sources of our knowledge. Not every ancient writer is a witness above suspicion, nor should we forget that everybody is as much a product of the age to which he belongs as he is a contributor to its progress. Here the philologist has the first claim to be heard; all investigation must rest on the results of his selfdenying labor. I am happy to find myself in complete agreement with Kurt Pfister, in his article *Kultus*, in Pauly-Wissowa 11.2110, lines 13-48. Furthermore, we have, in my opinion, no right to base conclusions regarding Greek belief on the utterance of a single author, no matter how great he is. The pure and deep speculations of Aeschylus about Zeus, "who has established the law that through suffering we learn" (Agam. 164-165) and "to whom none is to compare if we want to rid ourselves of our woe" (Agam. 153-155), were certainly not the common property even of his own townsmen, though in course of time they may have become so among the educated, just as there are to-day adherents of Goethe's or of Shelley's views of the Infinite. But we ought not to judge the beliefs of England or Germany by such persons, nor have we the right to judge Greek religion and mythology by the views of an Aeschylus or a Pindar. The same principle must be emphasized also for the monuments discovered by the archaeologist. To base the view of the nature of a god on an isolated monument, even from the hand of a Phidias, is no more justifiable. The conclusion is still less firmly founded if it rests on one 'sealing' from Crete or on one vase-painting.

Thus I desire from the outset to take issue with Miss Harrison's main thesis that our religious debt to Greece rests on the expulsion of fear from religion. It is true that Otto Gruppe (*Griechische Mythologie*, 752, 758 ff. [Munich, 1906]) has convincingly shown that an original, all-pervading belief in evil spirits was gradually crowded into the background under the influence of art, both literary and plastic. But he also concedes that the fear of such spirits remained at all times near the threshold of the conscious self, and that, without this assumption, the phenomena of the age of decay cannot be explained. In truth, the student of superstition will not even go so far. From my own investigations I am convinced that at all times the mass of the Greek people felt very deeply the dread of divine beings of a malevolent character. I cannot see, either, that Dr. Arthur Fairbanks is justified in saying, in his *Greek Religion* (14, 224, 303), that the chief characteristic of Greek religion is joyousness. Lastly, I must register my protest against the tendency of this whole school to ascribe everything in Greek religion which is sensuous and sexual to Semitic influence. Thus Miss Harrison says (146): "Touched by their <the Olympians's> humanity the Hebrew Jehovah lost much of his savagery, many of the traits he owes to the irresponsible thunderstorm". But that Yahwe denotes the god of the thunderstorm rests precisely on what Miss Harrison would reject in connection with Greek religion, namely, on etymological considerations (on the doubtfulness of the derivation see Cheyne, *Encyclopaedia Biblica* 3.3323, §114). Certainly, apply-

ing her own method, we may say that the cult seems to point to a sky god, no more savage than Zeus, and what is commonly called the refining of his character through loving kindness is assuredly far more the contribution of the prophets than of any Hellenizing influence (see also Solomon Schechter, *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, *passim*, especially Chapters V and VI [New York, 1909]).

Having thus defined our viewpoint, let us see how Miss Harrison deals with the topics of her book. Her Introduction contrasts Greek mythology with religious practice—reduced, as in her *Prolegomena*, 3, 7 (Cambridge, 1908), to "rites of riddance" and "rites of tendance"—, and bases religion on the primary instincts of hunger and propagation. Greek distinction lies in the beauty of imagery. When the author invokes the aid of psychology in claiming this as a "human prerogative" (xiii), because "in most animals... action follows on perception mechanically", she might to-day change her statements after Professor Wolfgang Koehler's report on his experiments with chimpanzees<sup>1</sup>. She justifies herself for completely ignoring the Romans with the assertion that the *numen* is devoid of human characteristics. "He has not even sex, or, at least, his sex is indeterminate". This surprising statement is based on the fact that in prayer the Romans addressed the god with *sive mas sive femina* (or *sive deus sive dea*). But Georg Wissowa (*Religion der Römer*, 37 [Munich 1912]) rightly explains that this formula is used if the worshipper is uncertain which god to invoke in a given case, a mental reservation, so to speak, by which he protects himself against the wrath of a neglected deity. Surely no Roman ever doubted the male sex of *Vervactor* or the female sex of *Panda*. It seems certain also that the grammatical gender carries with it the idea of an individual personality, even though no definite character save that of man or woman existed in the consciousness of the worshipper. Miss Harrison makes much of the statement of Herodotus (2.53) that Homer and Hesiod gave to the Greek gods their individual forms. While she is justified in this (see also Pfister, Pauly-Wissowa 11.2189, lines 49 ff.), she says here nothing new. Hermann Usener's *Götternamen* appeared in 1898, and, though he may have been mistaken in many of his assertions, his "Augenblicksgötter" and "Sondergötter", and his law that transparency of name acts against individualization have been the common property of the philological-historical view of religion ever since. In this connection I venture to protest also against Miss Harrison's statement—anticipated already by Adolf Furtwängler, in his work *Die Sammlung Sabouroff* (1886)—that the Gorgoneion existed as a mask independently of, and before, the conception of a Gorgon. I am, of course, not ignorant of the rôle which the mask plays in religious ceremonies all over

<sup>1</sup>Wolfgang Koehler, *The Mentality of Apes*, translated from the second German edition (London, 1925). Note the following quotation: "... intelligence tends to be called into play when circumstances block a course which seems obvious to us, leaving open a roundabout path, which the animal takes, so meeting the situation" (4). Compare the experiments with string breaking (8-9), rope pulling (26 ff.), stick fetching (32-33). See also the review of the book by Edward L. Thorndike, *The Nation*, April 15, 1925.



the world. But my claim is that it is merely a symbol or an abbreviation, *sive quo alio nomine vis vocare*, for the whole demoniac being. To the vivid imagination of the worshipper, especially in the ecstasy of religious dances, where the mask is chiefly used, it is sufficient for the performer to disguise his human face. The rest of the body is, so to speak, a 'quantité négligeable'. From the Gorgoneion, then, or similar masks, no argument can be drawn as to the non-existence of the complete individual. This must have been visualized in the ecstatic imagination before the mask could be created. For if, indeed, "such a being as a Gorgon never, of course, existed" (69), whence comes the head? Or does the author want us to believe that a head ever existed without an appropriate body? If we are to invoke psychology, it certainly teaches us one thing, namely, that artistic imagination cannot create anything absolutely new, that it must always use known elements, though it combines them into something not previously existing in that combination. Miss Harrison quotes Od. 11.632-635. But her interpretation (in which she follows Ameis-Hentze) is by no means certain. Just as on the Teiresias vase only the head of the seer is apparent, so we may think of this passage also: it would be sufficient to frighten Odysseus away if the Gorgo should appear merely *collo tenus*.

The body of the book deals with Hermes, Poseidon, the Mountain Mother, Demeter and Kore, the Maiden Goddesses, Hera, Athene, Aphrodite, Artemis, Apollo, Dionysos, and Zeus. The treatment of Hermes contrasts the Homeric messenger of the gods, swift, and winged-footed, with the immovable stone pillar image at Pharae, in Achaia, into whose ear the worshippers whispered their questions, to be answered by the first *kledon* heard upon going away. In the pillar Miss Harrison, rightly, with others, sees the origin of the god. But she carries her investigation further and finds the Homeric conception incompatible with that of actual worship. She even interprets the well-known fable of Babrios about the stonemason's dream as showing that the ancients were often conscious of this. But closer reading of the fable does not seem to warrant anything but the conclusion that the poet, as a sceptic, wanted to call our attention to the chance which can turn the same block of marble either into an image of a dead man or into a statue of an eternal god<sup>2</sup>. Light comes to Miss Harrison from Russia, where one and the same word means both 'grandfather' and 'boundary'. Thus Hermes becomes for her a pillar to commemorate the dead, to which the mourner prays for continued favor. Since the dead are buried in the ground, they are the *ploutodotae*; hence Hermes becomes Charidotes, guardian of the buried wealth and god of good luck. The Pharae oracle now is one from the dead: these have magic power; hence Hermes has the *rhabdos*; and this acquires its snakes because snakes coil around the tomb, or creep out of it, and are the symbol of the dead man. Among herders' tribes wealth consists in cattle: therefore Hermes, guardian of

wealth—in the earth—becomes the Kriophoros; and, since the ancestor also guards the children of the clan, Hermes is the Kourotrophos, from which function the author derives the statue of Praxiteles. Since the pillar oracle—it was first, we recall, the dead man himself—may be viewed as the medium of communication with the gods below, he naturally becomes the messenger of the gods above. But as such he must be freed from the ground in which his feet once were rooted; these are now fitted with winged sandals, and, lo, we have the Homeric swift messenger of the gods!

I have thus, faithfully, I trust, put Miss Harrison's reasoning, or rather train of hypotheses, before the reader, who may judge for himself the reliability of premises and conclusions. But we may perhaps voice a few scruples about accepting the thought of the author. If Hermes is merely a dead ancestor, why is he, in fully as primitive fashion, also represented by the cairn of loose stones to which each passer-by adds a contribution? True, the Greeks, like the orthodox Jews, put stones also on the graves. But the thought is not that of a fetish, but the much more natural, if cruder, idea of keeping the ghost where it belongs, below the ground, where it can do no harm to the living. And we find that herms represented not only Hermes, but also other gods. Miss Harrison herself quotes (135) the Hieron *cylis* from Berlin. This fact either makes the theory fall of its own weight or it leads inevitably to the conclusion—against which Miss Harrison would protest—that all herm-shaped gods are dead ancestors. Nor does the fact that the oldest herms, as far as we know, were even headless (compare the Apollon Agyieus) and that their first humanization consisted in the addition of the *ithyphallos*, support the author's assumption. To raise the question of principle again, it is just as possible that Hermes has attracted to himself by 'condensation'—the word is Eduard Meyer's—different 'Sondergötter' as that all his diverse functions have developed from one common root.

Similar unproven hypotheses characterize the most interesting of all the chapters, that on Poseidon. There never was a god Poseidon, the author says—from our standpoint (see on this also the interesting discussion by A. B. Drachmann, *Atheism in Pagan Antiquity*, 141-145; for a review of this book see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 18.102-104). There were only worshippers who imagined him and were in turn influenced by these images. Seeking, then, to explain the god out of the character of his worshippers, Miss Harrison sees in him, first, the god of people who fished, who valued horses, and who paid special attention to the bull. Such a people she finds in Crete of the Minoans. Archaeology comes again to her aid. The many representations of bull fights and bull sports, the seal impression on which a bull—or a man dressed in a bull's hide?—is seated on a throne surrounded by adorants, and in whom she sees the Minotaur, the "horns of consecration", all these prove to her that the origin of Poseidon worship must be found in Crete. She seeks to clinch her argument by the sarcophagus of Hagia

<sup>2</sup>Compare, in a way, Horace, *Sermones* 1.8.1-3.

C. K. >.

Triada and the statement that Poseidon worship is found on the mainland wherever we find Minoan-Mycenaean remains along the coast, marking, she thinks, the points at which Minoan conquerors entered Greece proper. But Poseidon Hippios bothers her. Crete is not a country favorable to the rearing of horses, even though chariots and teams appear on late Minoan monuments. But we have, she says, ocular proof that the horse was imported into the island. On a seal impression a horse is represented as standing on board a vessel, and the seal dates approximately from 1500 B. C., the date of the late Minoan monuments. She even believes that the horse can be pedigreed as coming from the famous Libyan studs, for it has a tufted mane, such as we find there. In Libya, then, Poseidon, the horse god, had his origin.

Again, I think, the outline of the argument suffices for its refutation. But there are valid objections on other grounds than that of probability. In the first place, it is well known that Minoan worship emphasized the female divinities to the almost complete exclusion of the male divinities. Secondly, if it were true that we find Poseidon worship wherever the Minoans landed in Greece, why have we found no Minoan traces in Corinth, which certainly offered inducements enough to a race entering Greece from the sea? Thirdly, granted that the horse on the seal impression is being imported into Crete, does it follow that with it the worship of the horse god entered also? Or should we perhaps see in the seal the documentary record of the arrival of a foreign cult, a close parallel to the arrival of the Great Mother in Rome? Do the sporting scenes with bulls prove anything for Minoan religion? Why do we find no bull images in the shrines of the *megara*? So far as the "horns of consecration" go, it is certainly more than questionable that they are conventionalized bull's horns. The famous Mycenaean silver *rhyton* appears rather to be a cow's head. Furthermore, horns have by themselves magic power. Certainly, the constant use of the "horns" as support of the double ax, the sacred pillar, even of trees, would seem to put them in a subordinate position rather than in that of a symbol for the chief god of the Minoans.

To traverse the other chapters of the book would be an entrancing task, but it would far exceed the limits of a review. Enough has been said, I think, to warrant the statement that Miss Harrison has written a very fascinating, stimulating, challenging work. But, unfortunately, it is a book entirely out of place in a series which makes its appeal chiefly to the educated layman who is not in a position to control the arguments by recourse to the sources. The reading public for which the series is meant is misled rather than guided when there are set before it as ascertained results what can be characterized only as a chain of brilliant hypotheses of doubtful correctness. Nor can the appended Bibliography be said to be serviceable. It is a curious farrago of popular and elementary books together with works of great scholarly merit, but also of highly controversial character. Certainly Guerber's *Myths of Greece and Rome* makes a strange bed-

fellow for Gruppe's *Religionsgeschichte* and Farnell's *Greek Cults*. Nor should the reader be directed to the one volume condensation of Frazer's *Golden Bough* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 17.54-55), a publication limited to the statements without any of the notes that alone make the monumental work useable. But to the specialist in the study of Greek religion—not mythology—the book, with all its shortcomings, will prove to be a stimulus for further study and research.

HUNTER COLLEGE

ERNST RIESS

Ad Alpes. A Story of Roman Life. By Herbert C. Nutting. University of California Press. Syllabus Series, No. 150 (1923). Pp. vii + 193. 80 cents.

This is a story, written in Latin, of Roman life and Roman history, designed for sight and supplementary work in the third year of the High School, and published without notes or vocabulary. It is the author's hope to add these at a later date, and so to make the book available as a regular text-book. The story is that of a Roman family, of the middle of the second century A. D., which travels from Ephesus to the Alps, by way of Brundisium and Rome. The family consists of the father and the mother, three sons, aged sixteen, ten, and one, and a daughter, aged twelve, besides two men slaves and a Jewish maid. The historic ground over which, and near which they travel suggests many interesting stories. When these fail, many others from Roman and Jewish history and mythology are related by the older members of the party for the benefit or the amusement of the others. Even the sixteen-year-old boy, who, luckily, is an omnivorous reader, contributes his share, and a trifle more.

The very nature of the story requires many words and uses foreign to Caesar and Cicero, but, in addition to these, the book is full of extremely idiomatic expressions that would be beyond the capacity of any third-year student to handle at sight, and would severely tax the knowledge of the average teacher. There are, besides, a number of words and constructions that lie outside the strictly classical boundary lines. While these things might seem rather serious objections to the use of the book for sight-reading work with those students who must pass the ordinary College examination, for which the required preparation in vocabulary and usage must be kept within fairly narrow limits, these objections would not hold, to anywhere nearly the same degree, for those who are not under this necessity, and the addition of adequate notes and a vocabulary would go far toward removing them altogether.

To write such Latin as the best writers of Roman literature would have written is a goal to which few makers of text-books have even approximately attained. In the judgment of the reviewer, Professor Nutting, in this respect, has achieved a rather remarkable success. The story, too, is cleverly designed, and has a sustained interest.

On the debit side, there seems to be an unnecessarily large number of misprints and careless mistakes, some



thirty of these having been noted, mostly mistprints. There are, besides, quite a number of minor infelicities, or usages which seem undesirable in such a book as this, of which the following are the most notable: the perfect infinitive with *accidit* (page 2); *nec...nec...aut* (12); *aliquamdiu...iam proveci sumus* (19: the ship was still sailing on); *Quam vellem adhuc esse Gallos*... (33); *Qua de re...locutus est...cum...ad eum abistis?* (62); *oportet...fuisse*, in the sense of 'must have been' (110); *Vide si hoc facilius intellegi potest*... (176); *His...persuasum est*, instead of *His rebus*, etc. (153); *parum* for *paulum* (158); *longe ante* for *multo ante* (175); and the frequent use of *dum*, meaning 'all the time while', with the present indicative, followed by the imperfect indicative, instead of with the more regular imperfect indicative (52, 76, 82, etc.).

THE ROXBURY SCHOOL  
CHESHIRE, CONN.

BERNARD M. ALLEN

### THE WILLOW, ANCIENT AND MODERN

In three passages Vergil writes of the willow as a bee-plant:

Eclogues 1.54-56:

Hinc tibi, quae semper, vicino ab limite saepes  
Hyblaeis apibus florem depasta salicti  
saepae levi somnum suadebit inire susurro...

Georgics 2.434-436:

Salices humilesque genistae  
aut illae pecori frondem aut pastoribus umbram  
sufficiunt saepemque satis et pabula melli.

Georgics 4.181-183:

<apes> pascuntur et arbuta passim  
et glaucas salices casiamque crocumque rubentem  
et pinguem tiliam et ferrugineos hyacinthos.

In the third passage Vergil lists the willow among the plants of the early spring, when its very early flowering makes it valuable. English authorities reckon it the earliest "bee-pasture" of Southern England, and in this country one may see the early bees hunting it out!

Vergil mentions the willow about twenty times in various connections. He knows more than one variety (Georgics 2.434), though of course not our native 'pussy willow' (*Salix discolor*) beloved of children. As shown in the first two passages quoted above, he knew it as a hedge-plant, useful here because of the ease with which it may be raised from cuttings, its rapid growth, and its endurance of cutting back. At one time nurserymen in this country pushed the white willow (*Salix Alba*) for that purpose. In a delightful book, *The Rescue of an Old Place*, by Mary Caroline Robbins, there is a good instance (13-16) of the planting of a willow hedge to secure an inexpensive and quick-growing screen and windbreak for the garden.

Further, the willow was useful in other ways on the farm. Cato and Varro (who quotes Cato) emphasize its importance and urge planting it along with reeds in wet places. Cato ranks the willow plantation third in order in his list of the nine most important products of the farm. Pliny quotes him (N. H. 16. 174) with approval, particularly because of the slight expense, effort, and risk involved, and the usefulness of the product. The long elastic shoots were used for tying up vines, and for binding faggots and bundles of various sorts, and 'still are used for such purposes. Baskets,

<The great value of Miss Johnston's paper is seen in the fact that in the fifth edition of the Conington-Nettleship Vergil, Volume 1, by F. Haverfield (London, George Bell and Sons, 1898), not a word is said about the matters of which Miss Johnston writes so well. There are ponderous notes on all sorts of themes, few of which, if any, need to be considered by one who wishes to understand, to appreciate, and to enjoy the poem. C. K.>

always needed, were woven from the willow. Beehives were sometimes made of willow. The flocks and the herds cropped the leaves. The wood made a quick hot fire in the kitchen. There were thus many reasons why, in Eclogue 1, the homeless Meliboeus mentions the willow hedge among the blessings enjoyed by the fortunate Tityrus.

Two old English names for the willow were *sallow* or *sally*, and *palm*. The latter came from its frequent use in the country, as the first and easiest green available, for palms on Palm Sunday.

ILLINOIS WOMAN'S COLLEGE,  
JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS

MARY JOHNSTON

### PETRONIUS 62.11

In Petronius, *Cena Trimalchionis* 62.11 the manuscript reading is as follows: "Si ante" inquit "venisses, saltem nobis adiutasses, lupus enim villam intravit et omnia pecora tamquam lanius sanguinem illis misit". Friedländer adds *perculit* after *pecora*, following Buecheler, editions two and three. But in Buecheler<sup>4</sup> (an edition due to W. Heraeus [Berlin, Weidmann, 1912]), there is a note as follows: "*verbum post pecora plerique inserunt, alii anacoluthon statuunt*". *Perculit* is, to be sure, easily supplied after *pecora*; its omission would correspond to a type of error sufficiently common in the manuscripts. The addition is, however, not necessary, since the sentence is not part of the narrative, but of the dialogue; a pause after *pecora* and the shift in construction bring out more vividly the speaker's excitement. Compare 37.9: *familia vero, babae babae! non mehercules puto decumam partem esse quae dominum suum noverit*. Here the anacoluthon similarly adds emphasis.

ILLINOIS WOMAN'S COLLEGE,  
JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS

MARY JOHNSTON

### PETRONIUS 37.10 AND 58.5

*in rutae folium conicere*

The mysterious expression *in rutae folium conicere* occurs twice in Petronius: 37.10 *Ad summam, quemvis ex istis babaecalis in rutae folium coniciet*; 58.5... *nec sursum nec deorsum cresco, nisi dominum tuum in rutae folium non conieci* (so Buecheler<sup>5</sup>, by W. Heraeus. The manuscript gives *conieci*. Most editors accept Heinsius's *conicero*). (Mr. J. M. Mitchell, the latest translator of Petronius (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 18.25-27), translates these passages as follows: "I assure you, any one of these half-baked wretches he could squeeze through the eye of a needle". "There's no up or down for me till I rub your master's nose with a prickly nettle...")

Neither translation helps one jot or one tittle; the note on 37.10 is futile.

The threat involved in the phrase *in rutae folium conicere* has never been satisfactorily explained. In so far as the editors say anything, they suggest that *in rutae folium* is "proverbial for a very small space". Lowe adds, "Among many nations rue is an emblem of insignificance. Hebrew, ye tithe the mint and the rue". The phrase occurs also in Martial 11.31.15-17.

Though Pliny, N. H. 20.131, states that *In praecipuis autem medicamentum ruta est*, this and other herbs are now so rarely grown in our gardens that *rutae folium* is meaningless to the average reader. Out of curiosity I bought some seeds (called in the seed catalogues *Ruta Graveolens*) and planted them. The beautiful scented foliage, however, makes the meaning no clearer, unless the elaborately divided fern-like leaf suggests that one might be knocked into so many bits.

ILLINOIS WOMAN'S COLLEGE,  
JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS

MARY JOHNSTON

THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON  
ON  
THE ANCIENTS AND NATURE

In a book entitled *Procession of the Flowers* (1897), Thomas Wentworth Higginson had an essay on April Days. In this occurs the following passage:

"The softer aspects of Nature, especially, require time and culture before man can enjoy them. To rude races her processes bring only terror, which is very slowly outgrown. Humboldt has best exhibited the scantiness of finer natural perceptions in Greek and Roman literature, in spite of the grand oceanic rhythm of Homer, and the delicate water-coloring of the Greek Anthology and of Horace. The Oriental and the Norse sacred books are full of fresh and beautiful allusions; but the Greek saw in Nature only a framework for Art and the Roman only a camping-ground for men. Even Vergil describes the grotto of Aeneas merely as a 'black grove' with 'horrid shade'—*Horrenti atrum nemus imminet umbra*. Wordsworth points out, that, even in English literature, the "Windsor Forest" of Anne, Countess of Winchelsea, was the first poem which represented Nature as a thing to be consciously studied.... In our own country, the early explorers seemed to find only horror in its woods and waterfalls. Josselyn, in 1672, could only describe the summer splendor of the White Mountain region as "dauntingly terrible, being full of rocky hills, as thick as molehills in a meadow, and full of infinite thick woods". Father Hennepin spoke of Niagara, in the narrative still quoted in the guide-books, as a "frightful cataract"; and honest John Adams could find no better name than "horrid chasm" for the picturesque gulf at Egg Rock, where he first saw the sea-anemone."

ILLINOIS WOMAN'S COLLEGE,  
JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS

MARY JOHNSTON

VERGIL, GEORGICS 1.311-334 AGAIN

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 19.107-109 Professor Knapp discussed a new interpretation of Vergil, Georgics 1.311-334, especially 326-327, suggested by Mr. Edward J. Kavanagh. The following verses from Lucretius (6.263-268), part of Lucretius's account of thunder, seem to me to support the interpretation:

neque enim caligine tanta  
obruerent terras, nisi inaedificata superne  
multa forent multis exempto nubila sole;  
nec tanto possent venientes opprimere imbri  
flumina abundare ut facerent camposque natate,  
si non exstructis foret alte nubibus aether.

The proposed interpretation is very attractive to me, in any case. The only mention of the sea in the passage of the *Iliad* which is cited, along with the Lucretius passage, as a general source for Vergil, is as a *terminus ad quem* for the swollen mountain torrents which 'groan upon their headlong way to the purple deep'

<To me this passage is interesting chiefly because there is so much in it that seems wrong. The world has been very slow to understand the attitude of the ancients toward nature. Certainly it was not till very recent times that certain of the *wilder* aspects of nature—mountain scenery, for example—was appreciated. Of the *softer* aspects both Greeks and Romans, as every scholar knows now, had genuine appreciation. On the whole subject see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 3.242-247, 9.137-138, 10.194-198, 14.40-51, 57-59, 16.17-18.

After I had read the proof of the foregoing paragraph, I noted in a book entitled *Modern English Statesmen*, by G. R. Stirling Taylor (my edition, a cheap one, bears the imprint of Robert M. McBride and Company, New York, 1921), a passage from Edmund Burke which seems pertinent here. On page 167 Mr. Taylor makes an allusion to Burke's great work on the French Revolution. Without giving an exact reference, he cites the following words, which, to me at least, throw light on Vergil's *horrenti umbra* and like expressions: "The passion caused by the great and sublime in nature... is astonishment; and astonishment is that state of the soul in which all its motions are suspended with some degree of horror..."

C. K. S.

(*Iliad* 16.391-392). The references, though not their application, are from the note by Messrs. Plessis and Lejay on Georgics 1.322 (*Oeuvres de Virgile, Texte Latin, Publiées avec une Introduction Biographique et Littéraire, etc.*, by F. Plessis and P. Lejay [Paris, Librairie Hachette, 1920]).

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

LESTER M. PRINDLE

MR. COLBY ON CATULLUS 1.7

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 19. 123 Mr. John K. Colby, in commenting on Catullus's line, *doctis, Iuppiter, et laboriosis*,—makes some sound observations on the probable character of Nepos's *Chronica*; but I cannot agree with his interpretation of the line itself. Nepos was neither learned nor painstaking, and Catullus himself tells us that this universal history contained only three books. Livy's history of Rome was about forty-eight times as long!

But if Nepos preferred lively and superficial historical sketches to genuine history, Catullus did not care for history even in the form of sugar-coated pills. To him three books of history seemed a superhuman task. I once wrote a book that some scholars are inclined to dismiss rather contemptuously as mere popularization; but, when a certain woman read it out of friendship, her comment was, "How can anybody write about such things?" Catullus was not jesting when he expressed amazement at the only universal history he had ever read.

I cannot stop without protesting against a casual remark in Mr. Colby's note: "I do, however, want to point out a few examples of his delightful humor, and of his ability to tell a good story—attributes which are not commonly possessed by the author of a learned dissertation". The truth is that a sense of humor and skill in telling a story are more common among those who have mastered the technique of exact scholarship than they are in the world at large. I could list twenty leading American classicists to illustrate the point, and I refrain only because the limits of my acquaintance would probably lead me to omit some of the best storytellers of them all. The name that will first occur to everyone is Gildersleeve. Nepos was no scholar, but his sense of humor cannot count as evidence in the case.

YALE UNIVERSITY

E. H. STURTEVANT

ON SAND AS B 'BLOTTER'

In the book entitled *Intimate Character Sketches of Abraham Lincoln*, by Henry B. Rankin (Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott, 1924), on pages 52-53, I find a reference to an article by Charles W. Moores, entitled *Abraham Lincoln, the Lawyer*, published in *Indiana Historical Society Publications*, Volume VII, No. 10. From this article, Mr. Rankin quotes as follows:

"Practically all of the pleadings of Stuart and Lincoln, and of Lincoln and Herndon—many of which I have seen—are in Lincoln's hand, and as clear as if written yesterday. They cover so many sheets, in the old Sangamon County files and in some other counties where the thief has not yet been, that one wonders how Lincoln had time for anything else. All are written with laborious care. The apt word is used; there are singularly few corrections; and the sand then used as a blotter still clings to the sheets."

I myself saw sand used for blotting ink, in Italy, at a railway station, in 1904. I fancy it was so used in Roman days. If any one can prove it, I shall be grateful.

CHARLES KNAPP